



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,360	08/31/2000	Leon Wong	13768.135.2	4462

22913 7590 05/21/2004

WORKMAN NYDEGGER (F/K/A WORKMAN NYDEGGER &
SEELEY)

60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/652,360

Applicant(s)

WONG ET AL.

Examiner

Chad Zhong

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 18-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 18-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

FINAL ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 04/29/2004. This action has been made final.

2. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination. In amendment B, filed on 04/29/2004:

Claims 1, 18, 26-27 are amended.

Claims 28-29 are new.

Claims 9-17 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 18-23, 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Powell, "LPRng-HOWTO".

8. As per claims 1 and 18, Powell teaches a computer network including a server computer system attachable to a plurality of client computer systems, a method of authenticating at least one of a subset of the plurality of client computer systems and/or users thereof, the method comprising:

an act of a server computer system receiving a request from a requesting client computer system, the request including an instruction identifying at least one authentication methodology that is to be used when authenticating a subset of client computer systems when the subset of client computer systems request service from the server computer system (pg 1, lines 10-11);

Art Unit: 2154

an act of the server computer system receiving a subsequent request, the subsequent request comprising a request from the subset of client computer systems for service from the server computer system (pg 2, lines 25-30); and

an act of the server computer system, upon receiving the subsequent request authenticating the requesting subset of the client computer systems using at least one the authentication methodology identified in the instruction (pg 2, lines 25-30).

9. As per claims 2 and 19, Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction to accept an assertion authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client computer systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

10. As per claims 3 and 20, Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction to accept a basic HTTP authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client computer systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

11. As per claims 4 and 21 Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction to accept a digest authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client computer systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

12. As per claims 5 and 22, Powell teaches wherein the instruction includes at least an instruction to accept an NTLM authentication method for use in authenticating the subset of client computer systems (pg 2, lines 34-35).

13. As per claims 6 and 23, Powell teaches wherein the subset of client computer systems is a single client computer system (pg 2, lines 12-13).

14. As per claims 8 and 25, Powell teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-

Art Unit: 2154

executable instructions for performing the acts recited in Claim 1 (pg 2, lines 18-24).

15. As per claim 26, Powell teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure having a plurality of fields, the data structure comprising:

a plurality of client identifier fields that each identify a client computer system that is connected to a server computer system (pg 2, lines 41-42); and

for each client computer system, the data structure further comprising at least one authentication field that identifies an authentication method to be used by the server computer system for authenticating the client computer system upon receiving a request from the client computer system for service. (pg 2, line 18, line 32-33).

16. As per claim 27, Powell teaches wherein each client identifier field identifies a single client computer system (pg 2, lines 41-42).

17. As per claim 28, Powell teaches a computer readable medium as recited in claim 26, wherein the server computer system has access to the data structure prior to receiving the request from the client computer (pg 2, lines 1-10, lines 25-30).

18. As per claim 29, Powell teaches a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 26, wherein the data structure is further configured to be altered upon being stored, so as to allow a client computer to use additional authentication methods (pg 2, lines 15-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2154

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 7 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, US 6,446,204 as applied to claims 1, 9 and 18 above.

21. As per claims 7 and 24, Powell does not teach wherein the request comprises a data structure that represents an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) element. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention to include XML element for use in client requests because doing so would improve the flexibility and versatility of Powell's system by utilizing flexible development of user-defined document types of XML. XML element would provide a robust, non-proprietary, persistent, and verifiable file format for the storage and transmission of text and data both on and off the Web; and it removes the more complex options of SGML, making it easier to program for.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's remarks filed 04/28/04 have been considered but are found not persuasive.

23. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Powell fails to disclose or suggest that server receives an initial client request that identifies an authentication methodology to use for authenticating a subset of client system, as well as receiving a subsequent request for service from a subset of client systems, by using the authentication methodology identified in the initial client request. In response to Applicant's argument, Powell does teach the above limitations.

Referring to pg 5, "16.6 lpd Server to Server Authentication". First it is well known in the art that a server is capable of handling multiple client requests, thus the first server received plurality of requests for service from a subset of the network which the first server is located, as is described on pg 2 of

Art Unit: 2154

Powell. Next, the first server is capable of sending multiple commands/jobs to a second server on behalf of the subset of clients. Therefore, the limitation of authenticating a subset of client system is taught by Powell in the above section. Next, referring to pg 2 of Powell, lines 15-42, during this section, Powell teaches the ability for any clients, which include any subset of clients in a network to choose among plurality of authentication methods, this means that the clients has the capability of choosing the same or different authentication methods as previous time.

24. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance that Powell fails to disclose or suggest a data structure having a plurality of client identifier fields that each identify a client computer system that is connected to a server computer system, and for each client computer system, the data structure further comprising at least one authentication field that identifies an authentication method to be used by the server computer system for authenticating the client computer system upon receiving a request from the client computer system for service, as claimed.

In response to Applicant's arguments, Powell does teach the above limitations.

Referring to page 2, lines 15-42, this section teaches the data structure which is capable of being used for by a typical computer system in the network. The Applicant should realize that this data structure can be re-used for all the computer systems that are clients, thus this section is only a sample of a particular computer system having the ability to choose their own authentication, and similar approaches can be carried out through the remainder of the network. Thus, in light of the above sections, Powell does teach Applicant's claim limitations.

25. In the remark, the Applicant argued in substance, that Powell fails to disclose or suggest using the recited authentication methods (e.g. assertion, basic HTTP, digest authentication, NTLM).

In response to Applicant's arguments, Powell does teach the above limitations.

Referring to pg 7, "16.8 Using PGP for Authentication", PGP is a form of basic HTTP and digest

Art Unit: 2154

authentication, because a secret key is being used, and user name and password is present as well.

Further, Kerberos is a form of NTLM, wherein the messages credentials are encrypted before sending to the next network node (pg 10, "Kerberos Installation Procedure", item #9). Finally, Examiner would like to point out that Powell suggest that additional authentication support is extremely simple to add (pg 1, Introduction). Thus, in conclusion, Powell does teach these authentication methodologies.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Methods and systems for selecting methodology for authenticating computer systems on a per computer system or per user basis".

- | | | |
|------|--------------|-----------------|
| i. | US 6,170,057 | Inoue et al. |
| ii. | US 5,721,780 | Ensor et al. |
| iii. | US 6,470,447 | Lambert et al. |
| iv. | US 6,278,449 | Sugiarto et al. |

Art Unit: 2154

- v. US 6,185, 612 Jensen et al
- vi. US 5,930,804 Yu et al.
- vii. US 5,909,503 Graves et al.
- viii. US 5,875,432 Sehr.
- ix. US 6,446,204 Pang et al.
- x. "SDSS Science Archives Security module API", Gyula P. Szokoly 1996.
- xi. "Sesame Authentication protocol"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CZ
May 13, 2004



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100